REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed January 3, 2007. Claims 1-75 were rejected. Claims 1-75 have been canceled. New claims 76-114 have been added. Reconsideration of the case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-18, 20-47, and 49-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stutz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,401,220 to Grey et al. (hereinafter "Grey").

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 76-114 recite subject matter that is patentable over Stutz and Grey. For example, claim 76 recites in pertinent part, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for determining the steps in the test executive sequence" and "executing the run-time operator interface application, wherein the control is operable to automatically determine the steps in the test executive sequence during execution of the run-time operator interface application, wherein the binding between the GUI element and the control causes the control to display at least a subset of the steps in the GUI element in response to the control determining the steps." Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Stutz and Grey does not teach these limitations.

Stutz relates generally to a method and system for creating connections between objects in an object-oriented program. Stutz teaches an example in which objects are connected to program an open file dialog box used for selecting a file to open. (See Col. 10, line 37 – Col. 11, line 35; and FIG. 5).

Grey relates generally to a test executive environment including step types for improved configurability and teaches run-time operator interface applications which provide a graphical user interface for executing test executive sequences on a production station.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Stutz and Grey do not fairly teach or suggest, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for determining

the steps in the test executive sequence". Stutz and Grey also do not fairly teach or suggest, "executing the run-time operator interface application, wherein the control is operable to automatically determine the steps in the test executive sequence during execution of the run-time operator interface application, wherein the binding between the GUI element and the control causes the control to display at least a subset of the steps in the GUI element in response to the control determining the steps." Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 76 is patentably distinct over Stutz and Grey.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Stutz and Grey do not teach the subject matter recited in the other independent claims. For example, claim 94 recites in pertinent part, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for generating a report for an execution of the test executive sequence" and "wherein the control is operable to automatically generate a report summarizing the one or more results of the execution of the test executive sequence in response to the execution of the test executive sequence, wherein the binding between the GUI element and the control causes the report to be displayed by the GUI element in response to the control generating the report." The cited references do not fairly teach or suggest these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 94.

Claim 95 recites in pertinent part, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for generating information indicating execution results for the test executive sequence" and "wherein the control is operable to automatically generate information indicating the one or more execution results in response to the execution of the test executive sequence, wherein the binding between the GUI element and the control causes the information indicating the one or more execution results to be displayed by the GUI element in response to the control generating the information." The cited references do not fairly teach or suggest these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 95.

Claim 96 recites in pertinent part, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for invoking execution of the test executive sequence" and "wherein

14

said configuring the binding between the GUI element and the control enables the control to automatically invoke execution of the test executive sequence in response to the user input received to the GUI element." The cited references do not fairly teach or suggest these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 96.

Claim 113 recites in pertinent part, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for stopping execution of the test executive sequence" and "wherein said configuring the binding between the GUI element and the control enables the control to automatically stop execution of the test executive sequence in response to the user input received to the GUI element." The cited references do not fairly teach or suggest these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 113.

Claim 114 recites in pertinent part, "including a control in the run-time operator interface application in response to user input, wherein the control includes pre-existing first functionality for selecting the test executive sequence and pre-existing second functionality for displaying steps in the test executive sequence" and "configuring a first binding between the first GUI element and the control, wherein the first binding enables the control to automatically invoke a dialog box enabling a user to select the test executive sequence in response to user input received to the first GUI element" and "configuring a second binding between the second GUI element and the control, wherein the second binding enables the control to automatically display the steps in the test executive sequence in the second GUI element in response to the user selecting the test executive sequence." The cited references do not fairly teach or suggest these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 114.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the independent claims are patentable over the cited references. Applicant further submits that several of the dependent claims recite further distinctions not taught or suggested by the cited references, taken either singly or in combination. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-77400/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

☐ Request for Continued Examination

☐ Terminal Disclaimer

☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers

☐ Notice of Change of Address

☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/

Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: April 3, 2007   JCH/JLB

16